



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

which is not conducive to enjoyment or to study; the duty of the call fulfilled, the day's work is done, and the rest of the evening is dedicated to pleasure instead of work. But it is considered of importance that the students should be thus socially brought together with their Professor, and they cannot afford to stay away, for a professor in Holland is but human: it may be different in other countries.

Everybody considers these meetings a great bore, more a task than a pleasure. But at de Vries' house it was different. Here everything went on informally; everybody felt at home at his first appearance, which never was his last. For de Vries' conversation was listened to with pleasure; as homely as he looked, so brilliant was every word he spoke. Thus did one learn to appreciate the power of one's native language, its wealth of expression and its importance for linguistic study. As Dr. Vos has stated, it was once from Dutch, not from Latin and Greek literature, that Germany derived its outside influence, and every student of English is aware of the important relations between the Dutch and the English languages. About this subject de Vries would be eloquent, and his words made a deep impression, for many, especially younger people, in Holland are inclined to consider their native tongue as unfit for literary purposes and their literature as offering no interest. Even such listeners would be inspired by de Vries' enthusiasm and beautiful choice of phrase, and they would enter with greater ardor upon a study they had undertaken because it was prescribed.

This being a session of a Modern Language Association, and Dutch being a modern language that has been considered of sufficient importance to be the subject of the opening paper of our meetings, a few personal reminiscences of de Vries did not seem to me to be out of place.

2. "The relation of early German Romanticism to the classic ideal."¹ By Professor Kuno Francke, of Harvard University.

Professor Henry Wood:

While listening to Professor Francke's criticism of Novalis' *Hymns to Night*, I asked myself, why is it that we smile at the description, and why is it that when Rossetti's *House of Life* is read, one does not smile? The situation is the same: the dead loved one and the living lover. With Rossetti it is the 'eternal womanly,' but Novalis has the further figure of the tear dropping from the heavenly one's eye, and forming a crystal chain which unites the lovers. This inconsistency of attitude towards the two poets may be partly explained by reference to the nature and scope of the

¹ This paper is now published, in this volume (p. 83 f.), under the title: "The social aspect of early German Romanticism."

Pre-Raphaelite movement in England. Whether we think much of Pre-Raphaelitism as a form of art, or not, we must recognize that in English literature it is a living issue. But when a German writer in a German book treats of Romanticism, he is apt to treat it as a dead issue. This is the point of view from which it seems to me the discussion of this paper can best be opened.

Modern literature has again arrived at the gates of Romanticism. Indeed, of French Impressionism we may say that it is already within those gates; and English literature, whatever it may be held to represent at the present time, is, in many of its phases, not far from the same goal. The Germans, on the contrary, still pause delightedly, to exercise the intermediate office of criticism,—of negative and destructive criticism of romanticism;—if, indeed, one may destructively criticize anything so destructive as we have to-day learned romanticism in German literature to be. It is particularly in view of these larger issues of romanticism that I must take issue with the paper under discussion.

Professor Francke says:—‘German romanticism is chiefly valuable as having founded patriotism in literature.’ I think that the school of literature which produced French and English romanticism, and which has been found to be profoundly interesting for the study of modern literature, in Germany and out of it, is something that must be studied by itself and for itself. True historical criticism in literature differs from a *priori* criticism, in that the former emphasizes whatever permanent elements any period of literature—even a sentimental period—has contributed; it appropriates positive results. But of positive criticism there are few traces in this paper. I find the criticism mostly negative;—that is, in this way negative, that the particular works chosen for discussion are under all circumstances the weakest works to be had, instead of the strongest.

To begin with *William Lovell*: Professor Francke terms romanticism a caricature of classicism; but we may speak of a caricature of romanticism, and I think *William Lovell* is such a caricature. Furthermore, it does not represent Tieck; I have always been dissatisfied with Brandes’ criticism of Tieck in that he unduly emphasizes this novel. In this particular instance, why would not *Franz Sternbald’s Wanderungen* have furnished a more positive and more fruitful point of view, if our eyes are to be directed towards what is permanent in literature? But from the point of view now proposed, *William Lovell* illustrates a fact I should like to present. In the histories of German literature, romanticism is usually squeezed into the smallest possible space. First, *Sturm und Drang* is separated; then the patriotic poetry is classed by itself, as it should be, on the whole; and what remains, having been reduced to the smallest possible bulk and to the most trivial elements possible, is criticized without mercy. But there is a point of view according to which romanticism and *Sturm und Drang* are not to be separated at all—according to which romanticism is shown to be an organic development from the earlier impetuous phase of literature. I think it can be proved

that Goethe took this view, as I shall illustrate in a moment. *William Lovell*, for instance, has a most remarkable affiliation with a group of works with which it has not to my knowledge been compared,—with the philosophical romances of Klinger. I need only remind you that these ten romances all centre in a series of Faust problems, and that Hauff's *Memoiren des Satans* is the last of a series, each member of which points back to that peculiar form of *Sturm und Drang* romance which is Klinger's own domain. But there is a most remarkable similarity between *William Lovell* and Klinger's *Faust Romances*; the same problems are handled, in much the same way, all the way through them. I call *William Lovell* a *Sturm und Drang* production, and if it represents romanticism, this is true only in so far as *Sturm und Drang* and romanticism may be classed together. *William Lovell* is a Faust figure, exactly as the characters in Klinger's romances are Faust figures. This, I think, will illustrate the point of view sufficiently. To return now to what I said a moment ago about Goethe: it is at least interesting to know what Goethe thought about romanticism. His judgment is not to be sought in such expressions as 'Romanticism is sickness,' which Goethe said also; it is to be looked for in such a production as the *Maskenzug von 1810*. This dramatic sketch I should call a most important implement for any workman in this period of literature who undertakes to determine either the tendencies or the results of romanticism. The whole production is retrospective. Goethe has here drawn conclusions of the most positive character, but not in any *a priori* way. After having sketched the history of romanticism, as it presents itself to him, he proceeds to call up certain figures from the past, and among these is one presently to be mentioned, which exactly corresponds with the view taken of romanticism in the *Walpurgisnachtstraum*, in the First Part of *Faust*. Professor Francke said that he was giving us a chapter out of the book he is finishing; I will take the liberty of giving a paragraph from a book not yet finished, and beg to direct your attention to certain considerations in regard to Goethe's notions of the connection between *Sturm und Drang* and romanticism.

The second title of the *Maskenzug* is, *Die romantische Poesie*. The author, after having called up a few living types of romantic poetry, ends by presenting a figure he calls Oberon. Goethe says that Oberon incorporates his notion of romantic poetry, and I make a connection between this figure and the Oberon of the *Walpurgisnachtstraum*. It can be proved, I think, that *Oberon's und Titania's goldne Hochzeit* represents the marriage of Titania with Oberon, that is, of *Sturm und Drang* with romantic poetry. Goethe wrote the *Walpurgisnachtstraum* during the very years when romanticism was winning its first successes and promising greater; or, in other words, during the very period of romanticism which Professor Francke has characterized as so very poor and so very destructive. The words of the Herold:

Dass die Hochzeit golden sei,
Soll'n fünfzig Jahr' sein vorüber;

Aber ist der Streit vorbei,
Das golden ist mir lieber,

give utterance to Goethe's own opinion of the possibility of uniting the new period of romanticism and the old period of *Sturm und Drang* in a harmonious union of literary activities. It is true that the subsequent development of German romanticism did not satisfy Goethe, and even his *Walpurgisnachtstraum* is in part polemical; but his *Maskenzug von 1810* shows us anew, in the figure of Oberon, that Goethe's eye was fixed upon what was permanent and lasting in the new movement. This is what I miss in the paper under discussion. It is easy, for instance, to criticize Friedrich Schlegel's *Lucinde*, but why has Professor Francke said nothing of Schlegel's splendid prose essays, all written before 1800, in which he attempted to interpret romantic poetry according to a new and brilliant, though faulty, theory of classicism?

The point of view, then, which I would submit is this, that if we are to give the element of proportion its due, especially in a book designed to teach literature; if we are to gain all that is positive out of a literary movement which we feel to be recurrent and, in some form or other, permanent;—then I would plead with Professor Francke to give romanticism a larger scope, and to win certain constructive aspects from it, which shall at least explain why we like some things in one literature, which are found to be exactly identical with things in another literature, which we disdain.

Professor Francke :

I am glad that Prof. Wood has called attention to the self imposed limitations of my paper. This paper deals with *early* Romanticism; it does *not* deal with those phases of Romanticism which Prof. Wood has mentioned. When Goethe, in 1810, wrote his 'Maskenzug,' *Die Romantische Poesie*, the aspect of Romanticism was totally different from what it was when Novalis wrote his *Heinrich von Ofterdingen*. Tieck and the Schlegels had entered upon an entirely new course, the former had published his *Minnelieder aus dem Schwäbischen Zeitalter*, the latter had revived Shakespere, the *Nibelungenlied*, Calderon, and the ancient Hindu literature. Arnim and Brentano had published *Des Knaben Wunderhorn*; Görres had written his *Die deutschen Volksbücher*. Fichte had delivered his *Reden an die deutsche Nation*; Heinrich von Kleist and Uhland had brought about the return of Romanticism to the classic ideal. All this did not lie within the scope of my paper. As to *early* Romanticism, I must maintain my view of it as essentially correct. I cannot help seeing in it primarily a symptom of the disintegration of Classicism.

3. "The Friar's Lantern." By Professor George Lyman Kittredge, of Harvard University.